

cap 2
1865
H 38
1866
A LETTER

TO

The Parishioners of St. Paul's,

HALIFAX,

BY

REV. GEORGE W. HILL,

Rector of St. Paul's.

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED BY MACNAB & SHAFFER,

1866.

ANGELICAN CHURCH OF CANADA



General Synod
of the
Church of England
in Canada

Church House **Toronto**

Accession
Number.....

MM53

H38

(copy 2)

A LETTER

TO

The Parishioners of St. Paul's,

HALIFAX,

BY

REV. GEORGE W. HILL,

Rector of St. Paul's.

HALIFAX, N. S.

**PRINTED BY MACNAB & SHAFFER,
1866.**

To
tak
mu
bec
ab
en

ou
fe
pr
ta
tr
w
p
o
a
p
t

A LETTER.

ST. PAUL'S PARISH, HALIFAX, NOV., 1866.

To the Parishioners of St. Paul's,—

MY BRETHREN,—A correspondence which has lately taken place between the Bishop and myself has been so much spoken of, and so much misunderstood that it has become necessary to publish it, in order that you may be able to form your own judgment on both the correspondence itself and the points at issue.

My fears have been awakened concerning the state of our Church in this Diocese for some time past, and these fears reached their crisis when I read in a public print professing to be the organ of the Church of England, certain letters which appeared therein. In these letters doctrine and practices are openly proclaimed and approved which strike at the very root of those distinctive principles and truths which it has been the honor and glory of our Church to maintain before the world for centuries; and he is no true friend of that Church who will fear to point out those errors to his people, and solemnly warn them of the peril which impends.

It is, my Brethren, to great principles that I desire to draw your attention, and with which alone I ask you to grapple. We have to do with something far more grave, more serious and deep-reaching than simply whether a man may wear a certain vestment, bow or turn his body at different times during Public Worship. These things have an importance, but this importance arises from the

fact that they have an origin that lies deep beneath the surface. They are indicators of doctrine. We have no fruit unless we have a plant whose root is in the soil, and I point you to these letters as unanswerable proof that anti-Protestant and unscriptural views are held and enunciated by some members of the Church of England in this Diocese.

With my Roman Catholic fellow countrymen I am entering into no controversy, and I beg to assure them one and all, that not only do I not wish at present to dispute with them their tenets, but I ever studiously avoid uttering one word that could be construed into a voluntary insult or be deemed an intentional disrespect to their views of religion,—as thousands who have known my public ministrations for the last nineteen years will bear me testimony. Thus, the point now is, not whether the Church of Rome is wrong and the Church of England right; but whether the Church of England holds the doctrines and authorizes the customs of the Church of Rome. In short, is the Church of England Roman Catholic? Impossible,—Is all history false? Why all that waste of blood in days gone by, and the outbreak of those terrible revolutions upon which successive generations look back with fear and shuddering? Why did a Roman Catholic Sovereign persecute Protestants, and a Protestant Sovereign persecute Roman Catholics? Were they fools or mad men, or were they both? Whatever moderns may think, those old champions on either side believed with all their heart that there was a gulf, and a wide one, between them,—*and that great gulf still yawns between us, as all true Protestants and true Roman Catholics still equally maintain.*

With this preface, my brethren, allow me to bring to your notice the following circular which I received a short time since :

CIRCULAR.

Rev'd. Sir,—The Executive Committee of Synod have determined, after careful deliberation, that it will not be expedient, at present, to issue a weekly publication, and they are of opinion that the *Church Chronicle*, now published, may be so modified and adapted to the wants of ordinary readers, as to secure extensive support if issued at a reduced price.

They therefore propose to make arrangements for the issue of the *Church Chronicle*, from the beginning of 1867, at half a dollar per annum, due at the first of each year.

It is intended that the paper shall be of a much more popular character than it has hitherto been, containing religious instruction with such information upon the affairs of the Church, at home and abroad, as her members may reasonably expect to receive.

If the number of subscribers is sufficient to warrant such an increase, the paper will be enlarged to double the present size. One parish has already engaged to take 100 copies, and the Committee request you to inform them—

1. How many subscribers may be expected from your parish or mission?
2. Will you guarantee the payment of the subscriptions for that number, or any portion of them?
3. If unwilling to do so, will you name some trustworthy person who will undertake to collect and remit the subscriptions from your parish early in the year?
4. Will you kindly address the Rev. E. Gilpin, Secretary of the Committee, in answer to the above questions, before the end of October next?

A few days after the reception of this circular I received the October number of the paper called the "*Church Chronicle*," proposed, you will perceive, as the basis of that future paper, to which it was desired that you should become subscribers. From that paper I select the follow-

ing articles for your perusal, noting at the same time that the usual disclaimer—"The editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of their correspondents," is no where to be found :

To the Editor of the Church Chronicle.

The article on Church Unity, in your last number was a welcome one,—and the words of our bishop, on the subject in his charge were full of the true spirit of christian love. But if we long for unity, as surely all must who love the Lord Jesus, and desire that His Holy Will should be done, why should we not pray more earnestly and systematically for the peace of Jerusalem?—Why should we be without a branch of an Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom? More than 8000 members of the Roman, Greek and Anglican Communions have joined it, and from each of them daily the prayer goes up to God for union. Those who join are not asked to compromise any principle, nor are they understood as expressing an opinion on any point of controversy. The daily use of a short form of prayer, together with one "Our Father"—for the intention of the association,—is the only obligation incurred by those who join it; to which is added in the case of priests, the offering at least once in three months, of the Holy Sacrifice for the same intention.

Surely Mr. Editor, if it were known that some priest or layman is willing to act as a diocesan secretary, in Nova Scotia, every Catholic would at once join, that he might help on the Holy Work. The following is the prescribed collect:—"O Lord Jesus Christ, Who saith unto Thine apostles, My peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; regard not my sins, but the faith of Thy Church, and grant Her that Peace and Unity which is agreeable to Thy Will, Who livest and reignest God for ever and ever. Amen.—Our Father,"

Observe, it is to pray for unity not according to our Will but according to God's Will. "And this is the confidence that we have in Him, that if we ask anything according to His Will, He heareth us."

To the Editor of the Church Chronicle.

On Sunday, 30th September, I had the pleasure of being present at the Consecration of a New Church at the Forks, near Windsor, and as a short account may be interesting to some of your readers, I shall endeavor to furnish it.—The day was all that could be desired, and a large number of persons were assembled to witness the solemn service. The first thing of course which one would notice is the church. The building consists of a nave and chancel, south porch and vestry. I do not know the dimensions, but should think it has from 180 to 200 kneelings.—the high-pitched roof, small Gothic windows and chancel, give it quite an ecclesiastical appearance; but it still needs the sacred emblem of our faith, to mark its being a christian building. However, as in his address the Bishop strongly recommended a cross upon the nave and chancel, alluding to the New Church in St. George's Parish as an example of how much they add to the appearance of a building, this want will doubtless soon be supplied. The interior looks very well, the roof is open and of stained wood, the windows of cathedral glass, the eastern one has a coloured border and the sacred monogram, the chancel is well raised, above the nave, the pulpit and prayer desk on their proper sides. There is as yet no font, but country parishes, I suppose have to get these things as they can afford them. The credence is conspicuous by its absence; so that oblations were brought from the vestry at the proper time, this, except at solemn services, when there are several assistants seems an inconvenient plan. The altar is very small, not nearly six feet long, and has not its three steps, but the small size of the sanctuary may account for their absence. There is no regular super-altar, but the shelf of the window might be made to answer for one. Making allowances for these defects, the interior as I have said looks well.

The consecration commenced by the Bishop, and the Archdeacon, being met at the church door by the Rev. Canon Hensley, and Rev. G. Hodgson,—the Bishop having assented to the petition, the procession moved up the church, xxiv psalm, being chanted for the processional. After a prayer the Bishop addressed the congregation, explaining the nature of the rite in which they were engaged.

His lordship was, as usual, plain, earnest, and practical. Some further consecration prayers then followed, when Rev. Mr. Henaley proceeded with mattins, there being proper psalms and lessons. After the third collect hymn 145 of hymns ancient and modern, was sung well and heartily. The litany was said by Rev. G. Hodgson. The Introit and hymn before sermon were from the S.P.C.K. hymn book. The Bishop was celebrant, assisted by the Archdeacon, as Epistoler. Although there were two other clergy present there was no Gospeller. Indeed any one disposed to criticise would probably have found some other things to find fault with at this part of the service. The office was commenced at the north end of the altar, instead of the north side as the rubric directs. Not one of the clergy turned to the east at the saying of the Nicene Creed, and the altar seemed to have lying on it more than the sacred vessels and the necessary office book. The Bishop preached from St. James, i. 22, urging upon the people, that they should be doers of the word heard in that place, and not hearers only,—his lordship particularly alluded to the awful neglect of our Blessed Lord's words, by the many who withdraw themselves from the Most Holy Sacrament of His Sacred Body and Blood.

Yours very truly,

ONE WHO WAS PRESENT.

On Thursday a third service was held in the pretty little church at Congueral, which was well filled. Morning prayer was said by Mr. Bullock, Mr. Spike read the lessons, and the sermon was preached by Mr. Moore, on "*the sole claim to the ministry of the Gospel, of those who have received episcopal ordination in succession from Christ and his Apostles.*"

You will hardly be surprised that on reading such articles I wrote the following reply:

ST. PAUL'S VESPERY, Halifax, Oct. 17, 1866.

Reverend Sir,—I received a circular a short time since, informing me that it was proposed to issue a Church paper,

and expressing the opinion of the proposers that the "Church Chronicle," now published, might be such paper, modified and adapted to the circumstances of the case; and I am asked, how many subscribers might be expected from my parish, and I now beg leave to reply:

Having carefully read the October number of the *Church Chronicle*, proposed as the basis of the future periodical, I have to say that in consequence of the general tone of the paper being at variance with my principles and views: in consequence of the mimicry of the language used by the Church of Rome, which language on its part is consistent because symbolic of certain dogmas held by it, but antagonistic to the doctrines held by the Church of England; and, lastly, in consequence of the open and avowed statement of unscriptural doctrine unequivocally set forth by one of the correspondents, whose opinions are not disclaimed by the editor—I shall not only not take the paper myself, but shall use my best influence to prevent its introduction into my parish.

Yours, &c., &c.,

GEORGE W. HILL,
Rector St. Paul's.

The Rev. E. GILPIN,
Secy. of Executive Com. of Synod.

This proposal then to furnish a periodical based on this publication as the organ of the Church of England in this diocese, together with the necessity of my deciding what course I should adopt with reference to advocating the collection of certain sums of money subscribed to what is known as the "Endowment Fund" (concerning which I had also received a circular from the Secretary) induced me to consider gravely the responsibility which I was asked to assume. And now permit me to lay before you a plain narrative of facts which will account for the correspondence which follows between the Bishop and myself, and which will, I am persuaded, throw clear and true light upon its cause, and the mode in which it was conducted on my part.

Having received the circulars above referred to, I acted

upon them as follows—first, I resolved in regard to the “Endowment Fund” to use my best efforts to complete it: and this simply from a desire to prevent my brethren in the ministry from suffering in consequence of the withdrawal of funds by “the society for propagating the Gospel in foreign parts.” I had already made a beginning in this work, and while waiting for a reply from a gentleman to whom I had spoken on this matter, I received, by mail from the country, the October number of the *Church Chronicle*. Certain parts were marked for my attention, and I read them with utter astonishment, the most unfeigned grief, and the strongest indignation. Is it possible, I asked myself, that the Church of England in Nova Scotia has come to this, that its organ can publicly avow such wishes and proclaim such doctrines, and no one in authority raise his voice or write a word to disavow the grave errors or counteract the poison? With regard, then, to the paper, I made up my mind and wrote to the Reverend Secretary as above. While deliberating as to the true and manly course to be taken in reference to the “Endowment Fund,” I received a note from the Bishop asking whether any decision had been arrived at by the party above mentioned, relative to his subscription. To this I delayed sending a reply, for the purpose of giving the question more thought. Before I came to a decided conclusion, and while still debating the subject in my mind, I met the Bishop in the hall of the Provincial Building. He was conversing with a gentleman, and I intended to make my bow and pass on, but his Lordship called to me and asked me a question relative to a day of thanksgiving, to which I made a reply. When this brief matter was concluded and we were left alone, I thought it would appear very uncourteous if I said nothing about his note, as it had remained so long unanswered, and so I stated, that I had received his Lordship's note, but had as yet no definite

reply to give on the question put, and I added, that so much had lately come openly to light in doctrine and practice, which I considered opposed to the teaching of the Church of England and her venerable practice, and that I was at once so startled and pained that I could not at present see any way clear to unite in the advocacy of the Endowment, or indeed take much part in any of our ecclesiastical schemes. I particularly specified the Church paper. His Lordship replied, that on seeing the letters (reprinted above) he had told the editor *that he disapproved of their being published*. I alluded to other things which had been done as indicators of certain views, which his Lordship endeavored to explain and justify. I then said that it would be of no practical use to discuss the question in that place, but *that I would put down on paper what my objections really were*. Something more was said by each, when I repeated *that the best way of stating my fears and anxieties would be to put them down on paper, that I would do so, and send the paper to his Lordship*. We then parted. When I went to my study immediately after, I wrote a few lines, but some parochial duty called me, and I put the letter aside, nor did I take up my pen again to finish it until the next week, when having, on the following Thursday, some leisure, I wrote to his Lordship a brief statement of my views of what had already taken place, and my strong convictions of the ultimate results of the errors which I saw creeping in.

This, my brethren, is the origin of the following correspondence. It was not unprovoked; it was not without cause. *I was definitely asked by authoritative circulars to do two things; until grave questions could be cleared up, I conscientiously declined doing so, and I wrote to the Bishop, the proper person, to give him in a frank, straight-forward manner, my reasons*. In placing these

reasons before his Lordship I purposed to do it without circumlocution, and while I intended to be neither disrespectful nor uncourteous, I equally intended to be clear and decisive. The subject was too grave to be treated with anything but language plain and forcible, and if taken up at all should be treated with the earnestness which its importance demanded.

HALIFAX, October 25, 1866.

My Lord,—I received a few days since your Lordship's note, asking me whether I had yet obtained an answer from Mr. ———, relative to the payment of his subscription to the Endowment Fund. He has not yet in any way communicated his final decision to me, and I partly regret that he has not done so without waiting for any further counsel with me, for within a few days circumstances have arisen which cause me to withdraw for the present my avowed intention of continuing to advocate the immediate payment of the sum subscribed by Mr. ———, as well as my promise, if he did so, of using my best endeavors towards having collected that unpaid portion of the proposed minimum of £20,000. I do not now say that I shall use any influence which my opinion may have with Mr. ——— to decide him to withhold that money, although I am not sure that my conscience is not dictating to me, that such would be my true course of duty. Without, however, pledging myself to any particular line of policy in respect to this, I am inclined just now to leave the question entirely to Mr. ——— himself.

It is, I think, due to your Lordship to give plainly my reasons for the position to which I have been driven by the saddening and melancholy exposure of doctrines and sentiments lately come openly to light. That they have been lurking under cover, I have had too good reason to believe, but now I am glad that the enemy is unmasked, whether it be by a premature and unintentional step on his part, or because of increasing boldness and resolve to bring the matter to a crisis.

For several years past I have watched with close and intense anxiety the course of events and the various movements taking place in the Church within this diocese, and it has not been without a sad and wearied heart, and mournful disappointment, that I have noted the gradual but sure development of a system of doctrine and practise antagonistic to the purity and simplicity of the faith once delivered to the saints—that faith as held and proclaimed by the pure branch of the Church of Christ, which once held the proud position of the bulwark of the Protestant Reformed Religion.

Among those things introduced by authority are strange innovations in the vestments to be worn by officiating ministers during public service, and thus attaching much importance to the mere color of a garment; for in this country no question can possibly arise as to which is the ordinary vestment in use, and the guilt of the blood which may arise is on their heads who pretending that it is of no consequence, nevertheless introduce, and, if they could, would force a novelty.

A vast importance is attached to church furniture, such as taking advantage of a non-committal decision of the Lords in Council to urge the placing of Credence Tables in Churches, which, notwithstanding their lordships' opinion, that it is more an adjunct to a Communion Table than to an altar, is well known by every man of intelligence and information to be specially symbolic of certain dogmas held by the Church of Rome, and we may rest assured that those in England now termed Ritualists who have sufficient courage openly to avow their sentiments would smile sarcastically at the feeble effort to disrobe their favorite emblem of its true meaning. Bodily worship in its various forms, assimilating our once reverent and simple ceremonial to the manners adopted by the Church of Rome is evidently encouraged: incessant bowings, crossings, genuflections, turnings, and the childish, if not blasphemous, custom of at certain times attempting to symbolize the Great Jehovah, the Infinite Trinity, by making an image with three fingers of the human hand: these and such things as these are offensively thrust upon the notice of those who once learned from the same Church that what our Father asked was the deep

homage of the heart and the dedication of the life. Can one be blind to the unscriptural views promulgated respecting the Lord's Supper, now fondly termed the Eucharist? While the Romanists are charged with substituting the Virgin Mary for Jesus, it is too plain that some false members of the Church of England are substituting bread and wine for that great and gracious Being. The term transubstantiation is indeed avoided, but we are told of the real presence; while every adjunct of the Lord's Supper which tends to invest it with mystical meaning and to enshroud it with superstitious awe is plainly fostered by act, if not distinctly recommended by words. Your Lordship studiously avoids the mere word "altar," though your pupils and followers glory in it and use it. But the shadow is of no consequence if we have the substance to contend with, and however the simple title may in this matter be abhorred the real thing itself is palpable enough. The plain old Communion Table, with its "fair white linen cloth," is, when possible, to be decked with cloths of gorgeous hue and rich embroidery; it must be raised to a certain height, be surrounded with its steps, approached with awe, and every circumstance of duty to be performed thereat be of such a nature as to call up the ideas of priest, altar and sacrifice. There is meaning in all these things or they are mere puerilities, simple child's play, and as I believe every intelligent man would indignantly repudiate the charge that he intended to trifle with God the only alternative is that they are emblematic, or symbolize truth or supposed truths.

Then we have the grave serious proposition made, in a paper conducted by a high dignitary of the Church and a doctor in divinity, of our duty to bring about a union with the Roman and Greek Churches. This indeed is proposed by a correspondent, but one I have some reason to believe who stands uncommonly high in your Lordship's favor. Putting aside the Church of Rome, is it not a sad sign of a falling Church when her guardians and directors are advocating union with the Greek Church. Can they possibly know anything of its history or tenets? and this, in preference to a union with those pure branches of the Church of Christ, singularly honored by the great Head of the body, during the last 300 years, in the conversion of sinners and

the e
bold
some
siste
for d
great
shew
Chur
the p
have
I sha
mina
on th
Prot
some
that
little
ritua
men
whic
rejec
pret
quit
Thos
furth
I
the
by t
pain
and
ing
by c
sacr
vati
the
men
obte
as r
we
and
duc
Jew

the edification of saints. Who can say, after this open bold avowal, that the leaning is not towards Rome with some, and towards its somewhat different but kindred sister? I am aware of the severe censure passed on Rome for dogmas lately promulgated, but I am also aware of the great principles so carefully laid down, by which Rome is shewn to be infinitely superior to those branches of the Church of Christ, which are stigmatized as being without the pale. Alas! that the Church of England should now have within its pale those who could make such a choice. I shall be told that the late movements which are now culminating to a head are simply a protest against ritualism on the one hand, and the extreme laxity of the sincere Protestant on the other. It certainly is possible that some may think so, but I trust that no one will imagine that we who oppose those errors and novelties have so little discernment as not to see that the principles of ritualism are adopted by those who are pining for vestments, furniture, and such things. It is true, some things which are not yet fully authorized by legal opinions are rejected, but everything for which there is the slightest pretence of authority is eagerly adopted. This fact is quite sufficient to decide the great question of principle. Those who go as far as they can now with safety, will go further still when their ground is sure.

I might add much more—the advocacy of prayers for the dead, the contemptible mimicry of the language used by the Church of Rome—but I forbear. It is a saddening, painful summary—Church furniture, clerical millinery, and posture making; this morbid sentimentalism boasting itself to be the real spirituality, seeking to introduce by degrees the whole sacerdotal doctrine and practice of a sacrificing priesthood, and of sacraments efficacious to salvation, because received at such hands: the visible Church, the only depository of saving grace, ministers of sacraments, the only dispensers of that grace, remission of sins obtained only through their ministry, in which they stand as mediators between us and God, so that by them only, we come to Christ, and through them to God; all this, and more than this, the development of the system introduced into our once peaceful midst. As the servant of Jesus Christ, ministering in the Church, I protest against

it all. As the fearless defender of His cause, who alone is my master, I shall not permit, without my strongest efforts to prevent it, that pure branch of the Church of the living God, to which I belong, to be corrupted and debased. I deny emphatically that the Church of England holds or teaches this new system. It is a gross libel that she does so. My birthright shall not be wrested from me; as God gave it me I shall keep it, and with my consent, by silence, it shall not be travestied and altered and made to appear what it is not. It is a bitter thing to be wounded in the house of one's friends, bitter grief for the Church of England to know that she has nursed in her own bosom the pinion which guided the shaft which has now pierced her to the heart; "more bitter than a serpent's tooth it is to have a thankless child."

But I must conclude a letter which I ought to have written a few weeks ago, but my duties (or other duties, for this is a stern and painful duty placed upon me by God) have prevented me until to-day completing a task which I began a few days since, but have never touched until now; as respects my writing, I would be a traitor to the trust reposed in me if silently I allowed the Church of my Lord and Master to be undermined or openly besieged, and as in my heart I believe the assault is being made, unintentionally by some, ignorantly by others, and (assigning no motives to any, but) by many with great power and determination, I must as a sincere and honest man plainly and unequivocally declare that I cannot and shall not advocate the support of societies and corporations which may be made the engine of furthering doctrines subversive of the Church of England as I received it. For these reasons I decline having anything to do with the Endowment Fund, or the establishment of a paper concerning which I received a circular a short time since from one of the cathedral clergy, reserving for the present my judgment relative to the Diocesan Church Society, etc.

Again, regretting the serious juncture to which I am driven and simply adding that I shall, with God's help, do my duty to Him and my country in striving to preserve in its purity and integrity the Church of Christ.

I am, my Lord, Very truly,

GEORGE W. HILL,

Rector of St. Paul's.

On the 6th I received the following reply :

HALIFAX, NOV. 6, 1866.

Reverend Sir,—My time has been so fully occupied with duties imperatively demanding my attention that I have been unable, had I been so disposed, to write an earlier answer to your letter, and moreover I have grave doubts, whether, considering its tone and temper, it would be consistent with due regard for my official character and position to do so, but remembering that "the servant of the Lord must be patient," in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; and that you are one of those for whom I must hereafter give account, I have at length determined to make an effort to open your eyes and to shew you the true character, according to my judgment, of the course which you have adopted.

In the first place with respect to Mr. ———. You know that the condition on which he bound himself to give £1000 to the Lord's treasury, towards the maintenance of the Ministers of the Gospel, have long since been fulfilled. The case is very simple: *he has given his bond to God*, and there can be no difficulty in deciding whether you, as his spiritual adviser, should recommend him to satisfy that bond or not. If he can be influenced by your opinion in the matter, you must share with him the responsibility, although you cannot relieve him from it.

With respect to the duty of supporting our Societies or otherwise, I read your opinion and resolve with the utmost astonishment and pain, not having supposed that any Christian could avow, or even secretly entertain, such sentiments. Do you actually mean to state that unless the ministers of our Church will, all of them, preach strictly in accordance with your opinions, you will, as far as depends upon you, deprive the poor destitute members of Christ's flock of the ministrations of the Word and Sacraments? You do definitely declare that, because you cannot compel all who may go forth preaching Christ crucified, to adopt your views, your interpretation of the formularies of the Church of England, to which they have pledged themselves not less conscientiously than yourself, you will not assist in providing funds for their maintenance, that so far as your influence extends, you will place

the members of our communion within this Province under an interdict, that the churches shall be closed, the Sacraments not administered, the people left without Christian burial. I trust that you have written without due consideration of the consequences that would ensue, supposing that you were able seriously to interfere with the work of our church societies, for, be it observed, there is no question here of a choice of channels or agencies, the required aid cannot be supplied except through these societies, the support of which you say you "cannot and shall not advocate." Any interference with the "Endowment Fund" is especially inexcusable, because it is for the benefit of future generations, even more than for the present, and it is so guarded that it cannot possibly be used for the propagation of the tenets of any one party rather than another. If you still, after calmer deliberation, adhere to your avowed determination, then, as an ambassador of Christ, in my Master's name, I solemnly warn you of the fearful peril which you will thereby incur for every soul which may perish for lack of the knowledge which might have been supplied through these agencies. Having under your care and influence those to whom God has committed a large portion of this world's goods, it is your duty to urge them to contribute abundantly towards the preaching of the Gospel; how great then your responsibility if you dissuade them from so doing!

But you endeavor to justify your determination by the statement contained in your letter, and upon these, therefore, I proceed to make some observations, although I cannot write as fully as I would, if I had more time at my own disposal. It is evident from the references in your letter to *authority, orders and recommendations* that you intend most especially to assail the *Bishop*, and to impute to him the evils which you have supposed to exist in this diocese. You moreover allege, as a reason for anxiety, that he now goes as far as he can, and your fears that he will hereafter go further. To which I reply, that if the consistent maintenance for fifteen years of the same principles, whether right or wrong, does not prove that I am sincere in my profession, I know not what proof would suffice. Whether my view be correct or not, I have uniformly maintained that strict adherence to the rules and

tenet
is the
and
pres
proof
the
view

Ye
plick
of E
this
who
to be
line
liber
conf
ligh
not
upon
calle
is on
prac
to r
to b
port
rule
awa
use
tute
the
that
been
from
city

Y
men
in
alw
hea
not
col
bla

tenets of our Church, in small things as well as in great, is the surest safeguard against Romanism on the one hand, and rationalism on the other. These sentiments are expressed as clearly in my *first* charge, to which I refer for proof, as in my last; and therefore there is no pretext for the suggestion that I may be adopting this course with a view to further steps hereafter.

You say much about maintaining the purity and simplicity of the faith, *as held and proclaimed by the Church of England*. Now I would ask any honest man whether this is most likely to be maintained by those clergymen who hold themselves bound in conscience to adhere strictly to her teaching *in all points*, both of doctrine and discipline (see my last charge, p. 8), or by those who claim the liberty of deciding for themselves how far they ought to conform. At all events, my principle is definite and intelligible, and the utmost that can be said against it, if it be not sound, is that it is an error in judgment. Acting upon this principle, when speaking of the ritualists, so called, I reminded the clergy that one dress, and one only, is ordered and authorized by our rules. You speak of the practice in this country as decisive, but I am not disposed to regard the Church *here* as standing by itself. If it is to be legally severed in any way, I attach the more importance on that account to strict adherence to all the rules and customs of the mother country, lest we drift away into a sea of uncertainty and irregularity. Now the use of the gown has never been so universal as to constitute a "custom" *there*. I have been informed that in the northern counties it has been little used, and we know that in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches it has never been adopted, and now it is banished by official orders from a Church which occupies a prominent place in this city (the Garrison Chapel).

You say that I attach importance to the *color* of a garment, which I deny, although I certainly may be justified in a preference for a color which, in the Scriptures, is always connected with purity and holiness, with which the heavenly host are said to be clothed. But the question is not, in fact, so much whether the minister shall wear one color or the other, whether he shall assume a white or a black robe, as whether he shall change his dress in the

course of the service, whether having begun with one vestment he shall afterwards adopt another, and change a second time whenever the Communion is to be celebrated. Can any one, for example, see a clergyman walk twice up and down St. Paul's, on such occasions, for the purpose of changing his vestment each time, without feeling that such a proceeding is wholly inconsistent with Protestant simplicity, and that nothing but unreasoning prejudice can be in favor of its continuance? The Bishop never changes his robe; why should other ministers do so? Any reason that can be given for the change must equally apply to him. A very strong argument against the use of the gown here is, that such a vestment has never been provided by the parishioners at any time in the history of this Colony,—every Church being provided with one or more surplices, and nothing more. You know that to a country clergyman, having to ride on horseback, or walk to a distant church, on a wet or hot day, the inconvenience of carrying the black gown is very great; whereas a surplice is always found hanging up in each Church, ready for him, and some of the clergy have abandoned the former solely on this account, and no man ought to be expected to provide for himself the vestment in which he is to officiate. I may add, that there is a reason for believing that the people first began to be accustomed to see the black gown in the pulpit, when strictly Romish garments, when the Pope sent the Dominicans, or Black Friars, to preach through Europe, interfering with the ordinary parish priests. It is suggested by some, that preaching in a surplice is a badge of a party; and there may have been some excuse for this supposition 20 or 30 years ago, when every restoration or observance of the long-neglected orders of the Church was thus stigmatized. At that time, every man who scraped the green mould off his chancel walls, or opened a bricked-up window was liable to suspicion; and the alterations made by you in the pews, &c., of St. Paul's would then have been regarded as unquestionable proofs of "High Church" tendencies; but I thought that we were wiser now. People in our day want to know the why, and the wherefore, of everything; long cherished customs are being successively abandoned, in the practice of law, of medicine, and in all departments.

It is M
and vic
time,
marry

If t
rights
to eld
indep
imme

We c
with t
Engla
will i
that t
ed I c
attem

Mich
may
endos
there
of an

the m
taken
dnce
Ther
lieve
admi

Ye
deme
never
with
The

it w
win
thep
the
dore

can
St
now
dun
Gat

It is the essence of formalism to be content to sit down and rise up, to kneel or stand, to put on this, or to put off that, without being able to give a reason for so doing, merely because we have been accustomed to do so.

If there is to be a change at all, we cannot deny the rights of conscience to those who believe themselves bound to adopt the changes positively ordered by the law and unimpeached. I see plainly the advancing wave gaining immense strength, and likely in due time to reach us. We cannot doubt that some of those who become familiar with the lately restored vestments through seeing them in England and America, or through published descriptions, will attempt to introduce them here, and I am resolved that to the best of my ability I shall oppose them, provided I can do so *honorably and impartially*. But I will not attempt to restrain one, while I allow license in another. Much of party spirit would urge me so to act, but I trust I may have grace and strength to deal as I have hitherto endeavored to deal, *impartially* to all. My special reasons therefore, for now more particularly objecting to the use of any other vestment than the surplice, is that I perceive the necessity for taking up a position which can be maintained and defended by an honest man against the introducers of new, or the restorers of obsolete vestments. There may be no necessity for this precaution, but I believe that those of us who may live a few years longer will admit that no other course could safely be adopted.

You erroneously assert that I "urge the placing of credence tables in Churches." I have not done so, and have never placed one in my own Chapel, being quite content with any arrangement by which the rubric can be obeyed. The facts are these: when I came to this city I found that it was the custom at St. Paul's to place the bread and wine for the Communion on the table, in accordance with the rubric, and when after about eight years the Lords of the Council *authoritatively* interpreted that Rubric and ordered it to be obeyed, I acquiesced. The Clergy generally to comply, and to adopt the practice so long established at St. Paul's. And on this account to be charged with inconstancy, and because you thought fit afterwards to change the practice, am I also to change, or to tell the Clergy to ignore your violation of a Rubric which you had

formerly obeyed. It is my duty to obey the laws, and to admonish the Clergy to do the same. Such obligations in these days are indeed too lightly regarded, but I must set an example of attention to them, and I would remind you that when a man has called upon God to help him, on the condition that he renders obedience to certain laws, the violation of them, whether they are of any intrinsic importance or not, becomes rather a serious matter for the transgressor.

I need not accurately consider the relative value of your opinion and that of the Lords of the Council, of whose "feeble efforts" you speak so contemptuously; but I can affirm that I am entirely ignorant of the peculiar connection of Credence Tables with the Romish system, which you so plainly discern. They still appear to me, to be merely convenient stands (literally sideboards), intended to obviate the necessity for going to the vestry for the bread and wine which, whether with or without reason, the law, as interpreted by the highest court of appeal, requires us to place upon the table at a certain point in the service.

You object to "bodily worship," why then do you kneel before your God? Persons are variously constituted; some have strong feelings of reverence which they cannot but manifest; others are differently affected, let every man in such things, "be fully persuaded in his own mind," but let no man judge his brother. Some feel so strongly, when their thoughts are concentrated upon their God and their own sinfulness, that they can scarcely avoid prostrating themselves before Him, after the manner of the worshippers in Heaven; even the Seraphim veil their faces. I imagine that you would have but a poor opinion of any persons who would sit at ease, in the most comfortable corner of their pews, during the whole of the service. You therefore approve in practice of the "bodily worship," which in theory you condemn. Of the incessant "bowings, crossings, genuflexions, turnings," mentioned, I know nothing, I content myself with the bowing at the name of Jesus enjoined by the 10th Canon and sanctioned by custom. As to the practice of other persons, I can say nothing, for when in church, I endeavor always to fix my mind on my own devotions, without giving any attention

to the
are pr
ence
heart
manif
swere
prece

W
that
the c
sacri
mony
ly us
may
state
mem
and
with
decid

Th
com
Bish
my c
all v
past
sens
all e
who
avoi

I
ever
alw
the
chu
mar
clot
dev
rat
son
wh
cal
ma

to the actions of those around me. If some of these things are practised by any persons, I think the charitable inference is that they proceed out of the abundance of the heart, of whose "deep homage" they are the outward manifestation. At any rate, I cannot be in any way answerable for that which I have not encouraged either by precept or example.

With respect to the Lord's Supper, I was not aware that it is now fondly termed the "Eucharist" by any of the clergy; but I am sure that the term, meaning "*a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving*," is not at all in harmony with the views which you condemn, and it is actually used by a writer of a strong anti-ritual article, which may probably have suggested some of the extraordinary statements in your letter. If any who call themselves members of the Church of England "are substituting bread and wine for that great and gracious Being," I quite agree with you that they are false members, whom I condemn as decidedly as you do.

The reference to my "pupils and followers" is so unbecoming that I might well be excused noticing it. As a Bishop, I am bound to teach, and so far all who recognize my office may be called my "pupils," and I suppose that all who shew any deference to the opinions of their chief pastor, may be called his "followers," but in any other sense, I know of neither pupils nor followers, and they at all events, have a strange mode of shewing their adherence who "glory in" a word which you admit I "studiously avoid."

I am not aware that any change has been made, or has even been proposed, in our Communion Tables. It has always been the custom to have a device of some sort upon the cloth covering the table, except in the very poorest churches; and if you were now to send to French, or any manufacturer, for one of the commonest kinds of worsted cloths, you would probably receive it with a monogram or device of some kind. The only covering of a more elaborate kind known to me, was presented to the cathedral by some ladies in England, in place of the old red cloth, which was unfit for a new building. It is of the ordinary color, and bears no device, to which any objection can be made by the most sincere Protestant, nothing in fact be-

yond a St. George's (not a Latin) cross, and some flowers or other ornaments, to which no particular signification can possibly be attached. When a new Communion Table is to be made, I certainly desire to have it suited to the purpose for which it is intended. If we are to sit at the Lord's Table, then we should be right in having it the height of an ordinary table, but since we are to stand at it, the height of a sideboard is much more convenient. Formerly the height was made up by cushions five or six inches thick, but now that the cushions are considered useless and expensive incumbrances, I frequently find serious inconvenience when reading from a book on a table too far below my eyes. With respect to steps, you ought to know that no ritualist would thank you for any steps, except the definite number of three within the Communion rails. So far as regards any particular views or rites, it matters not whether the table is raised on one step or a dozen, unless there are the definite three in the proper place. With a view to architectural effect, and the convenience of the speaker, it is certainly desirable to have the platform, on which the table stands, raised in proportion to the length of the building, but if there is any other reason for so doing, I am ignorant of it. You had a platform placed at the end of the Hall at Windsor, higher than any such platform in any church that I have seen in this Province. There is the same reason for the elevation in one case as in the other.

You say "there is meaning in all these things, or they are mere puerilities." Now I have told you that some of the things of which you speak have no existence except in your own imagination. With respect to the *others* you will perceive, if you consider for a moment, that if any one is liable to the censure implied in this observation, you are in the same predicament. Why did you give so much time and attention to the alterations in St. Paul's? Why did you remove the reading desk placed there when the first alteration was made, and substitute another? Why did you remove the old arm chairs which were very comfortable from within the communion rails, and substitute two high-backed seats in their place? You would probably answer that when there are several ways of doing things, we ought to take pains to find the best, that it is

right to have every thing appropriate to the purpose for which the building is intended, and that the new furniture is more suitable than the old. Can you not believe that others are influenced by the same, or equally good motives, and refrain from imputing sinister intentions to others who have done less in this way than you have? I may add that so far as I am concerned, I have had nothing to do with *changing* the furniture of any Church beyond making a slight alteration in the table in Salem Chapel originally made from my own design, previous to the last visitation, when I desired to have a good pattern for the inspection of the Clergy who might be building or altering churches. When the new portion of the Cathedral was built, it was of course necessary to make new arrangements and new furniture, which are as simple as they possibly can be, with any regard to the character of the building.

You will remember that when you spoke to me about the objectionable letter published in the *Church Chronicle*, I told you that I decidedly disapproved, and had immediately remonstrated with the Editor, who appears to have sent it to the printer, in accordance with his usual custom, considering that an Editor ought not to reject correspondence merely because he does not concur in the sentiments of the writer. You imagine that you know the author; if so, you have information not possessed by me, for I have no clue whatever to his name, and it would be inconsistent with that charity which "thinketh no evil" to suspect any man when there is not a shadow of proof. Your real object of attack is, however, evidently my *Charge*, p. 32, with respect to union with the Greek Church, with whose doctrines you are probably little acquainted, since you regard her in precisely the same light as the Church of Rome. According to the best works within my reach she denies the doctrine of Supererogation, Purgatory, and the infallibility of her earthly head, and necessity for auricular confession; does not number confirmation and extreme unction among the sacraments; does not use unleavened bread, and does not refuse the cup to the laity. There are still some grave corruptions which must be abandoned before we can hold communion with her; but surely if the above statement is correct, she is nearer to us than the

Roman Church. Moreover if I err in my views, I am in good company, since a Committee appointed at a General Convention of our sister Church in the United States, and another appointed by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, are investigating the subject, and the latter has lately been authorized to extend its enquiries to the other Oriental Churches.

In short, I believe that the desire for unity so evidently growing is implanted by God. It may perhaps be taken as one of the signs of the latter days, in preparation for the coming of the Lord; that good men are wearied of the innumerable divisions now existing, and are yearning for communion with all who call on the name of the Lord Jesus. But the object is unquestionably good, and it appears to me that the Church of which we are members may be designed as the instrument by which it is to be achieved. Among the many blessings vouchsafed to England, may certainly be reckoned the gracious Providence which guided and directed our Reformers, so that we have retained what was primitive, while we have rejected all unscriptural additions. Thus we occupy a remarkable position, intermediate between the Greek and Roman Churches on the one hand, and those who entirely rejected, instead of merely reforming the then existing system, or who, since the Reformation, have separated from us, on the other. Holding the ancient creeds, as well as the ancient constitution, we may hope that those old Churches may be led in time to admit that we have only rejected corruptions. And at the same time basing all our teaching upon the Scriptures, as the only infallible standard and guide, we may hope that those who have lost some portion of the primitive system, may be through us attracted back again. I may be too sanguine, but Englishmen will pardon the assumption, that He, who has so marvellously watched over both England and her Church, designs to employ them both as special instruments for carrying out His great purpose in the world.

The distinction mentioned in my Charge, which is so offensive to you, is not made by me, but by our Church, which declares that *from the Apostles' time*, there has been the three Orders—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons—and allows no minister, however gifted, however pious, to

officiate in her congregations, unless he "hath had Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination," while a Greek or Roman Priest is fully recognized as soon as he has recanted his errors. Moreover, you have not suggested any solution of the difficulty caused by the great number of separate denominations, and their continual increase. Are we to seek for union with *all* who profess to derive their tenets entirely from the Scriptures, even with Unitarians and Universalists, who do so most explicitly? If we *once leave the old paths* where are we to stop? What right have we dogmatically to affirm that some are orthodox and others are not so, according as they agree or disagree with *our* interpretation of Scripture, while they may all be as intelligent and honest as we are, and as sincerely seeking for the truth. At present we have a definite position in our adherence to Apostolic order; but if this be abandoned as a distinguishing mark, we may be required, in our endeavors after unity, to abandon one characteristic after another, until we have no original feature left. You cannot be ignorant of the existence of this practical difficulty, and it would have been more to the purpose to shew how it may be overcome, than to charge me and others with unduly appreciating one system, and undervaluing the merits of another.

I know not who may be "pining for furniture, vestments, and such things," and your charge is somewhat indefinite, so that I may not exactly catch your meaning; but for myself I can affirm that I certainly am not "pining for any such things," and solemnly repeat that I have conscientiously taken my stand, believing that I thus hold the only defensible position against "ritualism" on the one hand, and "extreme laxity," as well in doctrine as in practice on the other. I deny emphatically that I have taken advantage of any legal opinions, in support of any change; and if you have kept yourself acquainted with the occurrences of the last few years in England, you must be perfectly cognizant of the fact that any one wishing to avail himself of such sanction, might, on very good authority, introduce many alterations here. Your statement, therefore, that "every thing for which there is the slightest pretence of authority is eagerly adopted," is wholly and entirely without a shadow of foundation, so

far as regards myself. Any insinuation which may be contained in the statement, that "some will go further when their ground is sure," is sufficiently answered by my appeal to your experience of my consistency and steady adherence to the same course for 15 years.

Of the advocacy of "prayers for the dead" I have never heard a whisper from any clergyman here, the "mimicry of the language used by the Church of Rome," is as contemptible in my opinion as it is in yours, and I have never been slow to condemn it.

I now come to your "summary." Your observations upon "Church furniture" and "posture-making," I have already answered. Of "Clerical Millinery" I have not seen a single example of any kind, and I presume that you have simply taken the expression from some book or newspaper. There has been in fact no new form, or style of vestment of any kind, and I should say that, if there is any difference in the latest importation of surplices, that there is rather less needle work than formerly about the upper part. I have occasionally seen a new black gown of rustling silk presented to some favored clergyman by the ladies, but that is the nearest approach to Clerical Millinery that I have noticed.

But your further observations are much more serious. You charge some of us, whether myself or my Brethren, or both, it matters not, with holding and teaching opinions which I utterly repudiate, which are wholly repugnant to my feelings, against which, if expressed in my presence, I should enter a solemn protest. I have never heard such doctrines preached, nor do I know where you have found them. It seems almost as if you had been deceived by some horrible dream, and were now, upon awaking, assuming as realities all that you had imagined. Is it possible that you can suspect any of your Brethren of holding that "we can only come to Christ" by men who "stand as mediators between us and God," that "the visible Church is the only depository of saving grace, ministers of Sacraments the only dispensers of that grace, remission of sins obtained only through their ministry?" It is painful even to quote such expressions. Now the other charges may be passed over as frivolous, but this last is so serious, that I call upon you to name those who

are suspected of holding such opinions, and if you can prove your statement, I will pledge myself that it shall not be my fault if such persons are not either effectually silenced, or removed from the Diocese.

To make such charges *without proof* is so inconsistent with the character of a Christian or a gentleman, that I am very unwilling to suspect you of having done so, and yet it would be so dreadful to think that any Clergyman can have laid himself open to them, that I cannot believe it till the proof is adduced.

You say, "I deny emphatically that the Church of England holds or teaches this new system." What new system do you mean? Is it contrary to the language of the articles, the prayer book and the catechism, or any of them? If so, who holds or teaches it? Instead of thus making general accusations, name the guilty parties, adduce your proofs, lay them before ~~me~~ who am pledged to "banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine," and if after having received such well sustained charges, I do not take action upon them to the extent of my ability, you may then perhaps fairly assume that I am inclined to favor the accused. But until you can do this, you are not justified in making such statements. This is a case in which I dare not hold my peace, I must speak plainly. Can you possibly believe that any good is to be done by suggesting suspicions and evil surmises to your people? Is it not rather probable that they will be much injured, their minds being excited and agitated, and engaged with controversy, and diverted from watching and prayer? If there were indeed any real danger to be apprehended, it would be your duty calmly and dispassionately to put them on their guard; but you are doing them grievous wrong, inflicting injury which all your efforts may be insufficient to remedy, when without any real or probable cause for alarm, you arouse their passions and create doubts and suspicions which though very easily awakened, are by no means so easily quieted. You know, or ought to know, that in all our pulpits Christ is preached, with more or less of power, with some variations it may be in the mode of expression, but truly and faithfully. Of this at least, I am certain, and I confidently appeal to all the clergy to bear witness to my words, that

in public and in private the substance of my reiterated exhortations has been to make it their first great object to bring men to Christ, to persuade them to look to Him and to rest in Him alone "who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption." You have heard the most solemn and formal declarations of my sentiments in my Charge, which are permanent records; and I refer to them also to prove that my great object is to set forth Christ as "the way, the truth, and the life," as the only mediator, the only refuge for sinners.

With respect to the Church, its ministers and its Sacraments, I trust that all the clergy generally agree with the views represented in my last Charge, pages 38-40, these being in accordance with our authoritative expositions of doctrine. If there is a visible Church, there must also necessarily be officers and ordinances. Since there are many distinct bodies of Christians, holding no recognized Communion, one with the other, surely we are bound to examine to find out which is, upon the whole, most in accordance with Christ's institution; and having found it we ought to cleave to it, we ought highly to value it, because we believe it to be the truest representative of the Church as originally founded by Him, and organized by His inspired Apostles. We, as ministers of this Church, are bound also to satisfy ourselves that we are acting under a valid commission, and you no doubt consider yourself fully authorized to speak and act as an ambassador for Christ. The commission given to you at your ordination is either a solemn reality, investing you with power to speak and act in the name of the Lord, with an authority which you could not otherwise presume to exercise, or it is horrible blasphemy. If you attach any meaning at all to it, you probably do not differ much from your brethren, whom you falsely accuse; if otherwise, you ought not to continue to officiate under it.

But while we confidently rely upon our own commission we do not judge of others. We do not presume to limit the operations of God's grace. He uses a variety of instruments, and we believe that the preaching of His word is made effectual to the saving of souls, notwithstanding some irregularities and defects, the extent of which we do

not care to determine. We rejoice when "Christ is preached," even in those extreme cases where it may be said to be "of envy and strife." St. Paul's teaching on this subject, in Cor. iii. 10-15, is so clear that little room appears to me to be left for difference of opinion in the minds of any who take Scripture as their guide. We must believe that *all* who truly build upon Christ will be saved, but that it is far from immaterial whether we hold the whole truth in its purity or otherwise, that if we adopt anything but the pure gold there will be a loss proportionate to the extent of the adulteration, or the inferiority of the materials. If we are required to be more comprehensive than the Apostles, we can only say "we have not so learned Christ," that God's word must be our guide.

You appear especially to condemn your brethren on account of the views which they, or some of them, are supposed to hold concerning the Sacraments. I, therefore, ask you definitely, do you, or do you not, hold, that, "Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only tokens or badges of Christian men's professions," &c., as defined in Art. 25? If you *do*, have you reason to assume that any of us hold more than this? Have you studied the language of the Articles, the Catechism, and the offices of administration of the two Sacraments? and are you sure that you entirely concur in the views there expressed? I do not speak of interpretations which may be deduced by twisting or pressing the language unduly on one side or the other, but of a plain, straightforward construction. If any one goes beyond these, you were quite right in charging him with unsoundness, *regarded as a Clergyman of the Church of England*, but if you are objecting to the use of *her* language, and moreover if you cannot yourself use *her* words in your teaching, surely you are self-condemned when you presume to charge others with deviating from the line marked out for them.

I assume that you believe yourself to have some proofs of your charges, on which I therefore forbear to pronounce any opinion, until they have been submitted to me. At present I can only say, that *I* have not heard language used by any of my brethren, that could be alleged as a plausible justification of your charges by any one who has thoroughly studied the tenets maintained by the Church, and compared them with the teaching of Scripture.

In short, the most charitable construction that I can put upon your letter is, that you have not had sufficient time for study, that having been engaged in active Parochial work since your ordination, with the exception of a brief period at Windsor, you have not been able to give that "attendance to reading" which is essential that we may be able to discriminate accurately between truth and error, without which no man can be qualified to pronounce dogmatically, that a brother, who has equally with himself declared his hearty assent to certain formularies, is either hypocritical, or inconsistent, because he uses a somewhat different phraseology.

May not the explanation of the supposed difference between yourself and some of your brethren be as follows? You have not felt justified in directing the minds of your people to anything beyond the fundamental "principles of the doctrines of Christ," as enumerated in Heb. vi. 12, but some of us think that we are permitted, and even required, to lead them on to something more. While we lay chief stress upon those first principles, and are continually inculcating them most earnestly, we nevertheless think that we ought to go on towards perfection, to endeavor to unfold the *whole* counsel of God, so far as it is revealed to us. Besides the great doctrines of the Incarnation, and the Atonement, we have to explain the nature of Christ's Kingdom upon earth, with the teaching of God's Word concerning His Church, His Ministers, and His Sacraments. You may think that your people are not "yet able to bear it," give them therefore what is most appropriate for them, but while you think it needful to practice reserve in the communication of religious knowledge, do not condemn those who long to communicate to their congregations the fullness of the divine revelation, to impart to them the *entire* and *complete* system of doctrine and discipline which they are fully persuaded is contained in or plainly deduced from the Holy Scriptures.

In conclusion, I assure you that I have seldom, if ever, had a more painful duty than to perform this writing of this letter.

I have scrupulously endeavored to avoid any approach to the style or spirit in which you have addressed me,

and I trust that not even the just indignation which might be felt at your unprovoked attack on my highly esteemed brethren and fellow laborers, has betrayed me into the use of any expression too strong for the occasion. With regard to the mode in which I have been personally assailed, my feelings towards you are much more those of pity than of anger.

If you are satisfied with what you have done, if you can justify it to your own conscience, it is useless for me to say anything more, although I may observe that a Bishop who has been laboring in his diocese for fifteen years, however unworthily, might reasonably have supposed that he could not be subjected to such treatment, from any of those, whether clergy or laity, who have accepted and recognised him as their chief pastor under Christ.

Earnestly praying that He who has built His Church upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone, may grant us all to be joined together in unity of spirit by their doctrine, and may pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, without which whosoever liveth is counted dead before Him,

I am, Rev'd. Sir,

Yours faithfully,

H. NOVA SCOTIA.

To this long letter I sent a reply on Tuesday, Nov. 18 :

HALIFAX, Nov. 12th, 1866.

My Lord,—Passing over all personal observations in your reply of November 5th to me, I shall at once proceed to a consideration of those great principles involved in the points at issue, as alone worthy the time and the thought of one who is seeking to grapple with evil, and to guard from error the Church of Christ.

With regard to Mr. ——— and his subscription to the Endowment, and my own withholding any advocacy of that measure for the present, I maintain that if a man has conscientious convictions that error has sprung up in an institution after he has subscribed a sum of money to its funds, he is not only perfectly justified in refusing to pay it, but bound to withhold it, until he is convinced that such error does not exist, or, if found to exist, shall be rooted out and banished. Is it possible that a man is under a bond to propagate evil because he once pledged himself to

support a society that at the time of his so pledging himself was, in his opinion, sound and pure in principle? That cannot be; it is contrary to common sense, to daily experience, and, above all, to the teaching of Scripture. All promises are made on conditions implied if not expressed. It is more often deemed unnecessary to state than to give form in words to those conditions which may be attached thereto. This is occurring constantly. A father promises to present his son, when he arrives at a certain age, with a valuable estate, or to bequeath him a rich inheritance. At the time of his doing so, his son's character and life are just such as he approves, his principles are sound, and he gives evidence of a useful future. — Never for a moment suspecting a fall, the father mentions no conditions. He sees no need of it. Unhappily his son embraces evil and dangerous opinions; becomes the companion of wicked men, and in his turn the corrupter of others. Who would censure that father, when he saw the sad change, for withholding the money and the inheritance which, under other circumstances, he once solemnly promised, but which now would only pander to his child's depraved tastes, and hurry him with more rapid strides to ruin? His promise was contingent, even though not expressed in words. And this great principle is clearly laid down in Scripture—The promises of our heavenly Father are contingent—they are implied when not expressed. Never was a more solemn promise made than that to Eli, and in so many words conditions were not attached—"Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed that thy house and the house of thy father should walk before me for ever: but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me, for them that honor me, I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." God had indeed promised, but when the sons of Eli made themselves vile, His promise was no longer binding. To the *principle* here involved I desire to draw attention, and not to *any other analogy* which might be instituted, namely:—that my promise, or that of any other man, is not binding if error or evil calculated to do harm has sprung up since the promise was first made. And hence I not only consider myself perfectly and wholly free from the obligation to further and promote institutions which may, in my conscientious judgment, become, through the introduction of

principles with which I cannot agree, the instruments of disseminating erroneous views on matters of vital interest, but that I am sacredly called upon to withdraw my name and influence therefrom.

You ask me, "do you actually mean to state that, unless the ministers of our Church will all of them preach strictly in accordance with your opinions, you will, as far as depends upon you, deprive the poor destitute members of Christ's flock of the ministration of the word and sacraments? You do definitely declare," &c. I state no such thing, either in words or by fair inference.—Your Lordship must be as well aware of this fact as myself.—As you appeal to fifteen years, I appeal to nearly nineteen years of a career, not unknown to the public in this Province, in testimony that such a deduction is utterly baseless. Not only have I taken active and prominent part in promoting the institutions connected with our Church, using my best powers, —whatever they may be—to create and increase the endowment of the College and the Church, urging, and I believe, not unsuccessfully, the claims of the different societies on those around me, and endeavoring on every occasion that presented itself to increase the stipends and personal comforts of my brethren in the ministry, from many of whom I differed widely in opinion; but I have been actually charged in days gone by with associating with men of different denominations from whom I was separated by opinions different from ours.—Indeed it was at one time brought forward as a serious obstacle to my being appointed to the Professorship of Theology, that I was too willing to unite with those who held views not in accordance with my own; that, in fact, I had "taken part with preachers of all denominations, and professing every variety of creed, in associations and public meetings." The same motives which guided, and the same spirit which animated me then guide and animate me now—and my views are as broad, enlightened and liberal to-day as they were at that time—and though ministers and laymen within my own church see some doctrines in a different light from myself, I am as ready as ever to work with them and for them, when no vital error is likely to be propagated by so doing.—I ask no man, be he churchman or dissenter, to pronounce my Shibboleth on all points.—But there are limits beyond which no true man would dare to go. When

positive error denounced by the Church is openly proclaimed or may be disseminated by any society of which he is a member—he is bound by all moral law to denounce the error and withhold his aid. Suppose "Universalism" had been imbibed by the members of the Church of England, and that doctrine was being propagated, or likely to be, through the agency of a Church Society, would your Lordship feel yourself bound to support such society? I am persuaded that no man would be more ready to raise his voice against the grave error which had crept in, or more forward to withhold the aid which he gave to any Society for the purpose of disseminating truth and not error. You might and would support those men though they held opinions in some matters at variance with your own. You would not object to one because an Arminian and to another because a Calvinist, but you would object to either Arminian or Calvinist if either of them stepped over the boundary line between truth and error—preaching Universalism or any other doctrine which involved the vital interests of men's souls! And if I see the doctrines of the Lord's Supper unscripturally set forth, I am equally justified, for wrong views on this are at the root of all the evils which I fear.

Of the results accruing hereafter from the conscientious determination avowed by me of withholding, for the present my advocacy of the Endowment Fund, I have no fear, I assure you; for I am not-unmindful of the beautiful and appropriate verse quoted by you, "let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," and most fully do I intend to be so, that I may not lose the comfort of a clear conscience in this world, nor merit punishment for acting against it, in the world to come. Like St. Paul, I can say, "with me it is a small thing that I should be judged of man's judgment. He that judgeth me is the Lord."

You say that it is evident that I intend to "assail the Bishop and to impute to him the evils which you have supposed to exist in this diocese." You will observe by reference to my letter that some of the evils concerning which I speak are directly referable to your Lordship, while others are to be referred to a party or parties not specified. And you further state that I allege as a reason for anxiety that "the Bishop now goes as far as he can, and my fears that he will hereafter go further." I am

not aware that I specified the Bishop, but asserted that which may be termed an axiom in metaphysics, to which I imagine you will subscribe as readily and as fully as myself—"That those," &c. The application of that axiom is unquestionably of great importance in the present inquiry. If your Lordship has made no such alterations as those spoken of since you came into the Diocese, if the Diocese is exactly in these respects as you found it, then it cannot by any possibility be applied to you. But as your Lordship assumes that the remark applies particularly to yourself, might not the inference be fairly drawn from those charges to which you refer, that when any clear legal opinions gave countenance to any customs, you seized the opportunity to bring such forward. I read those charges before I wrote to your Lordship, and I have since read them a second time, and the impression is even stronger on my mind that the authority is "eagerly adopted." The subject of rites is briefly touched upon, but with no uncertain sound, in pp. 14 and 15 of the first charge, and the high value set upon them to be clearly seen; but in charge the second, the subject of rites, customs, and furniture, is dwelt upon from p. 29-33, and one could scarcely be accused of drawing an unfair or unjust conclusion from the whole style and tone of remark that the "legal opinion" was seized for the purpose of virtually recommending Crosses, Credence Tables, and Cloths for the Communion Table. Such, at least, is the light in which it appears to me. In the last charge we have reference to the vestments, to which, however, an allusion must hereinafter more especially be made, I now merely point. But judging simply from the fact that when clear and definite legal opinion was pronounced it was used, one might justly infer that all such decisions in successive order as they came out would be made like use of. It was not, however, to those alone that I referred, but to some other minor matters which I perceived as becoming common among some members of the Church.

Your Lordship speaks strongly in this connection of the importance of strict adherence to all the rules and customs of the Mother Country. I also think it most important to adhere as closely to the good old customs of that glorious land, and yet the Church here, in this Province, has already actually set up for itself, that is in so far as represent-

ed by the Synod, and has determined "not to accept the new Canons." Some of us long foresaw and foretold the evils which would arise when once the door for change was opened, and the time is not far distant when this beginning of secession on a vital point from the Mother Church will end in "drifting away into a sea of uncertainty and irregularity."

You deny that you attach importance to the color of a garment. Is it not, I may be allowed to ask, attaching great importance to it when one is substituted for another which has invariably been worn in the old parishes in this Diocese; when it must have been well known that, rightly or wrongly, foolishly or wisely, the introduction of the surplice would be so viewed by many in this country as to be the cause of the deepest offence, and perfectly certain to bring about most unhappy divisions? Surely if, in the abstract, a man is morally aware from warnings given him or from what he knows of himself, that a measure which he proposes to adopt will result in arousing the wrath and indignation of hundreds, he must attach importance to that measure, or nothing would induce him to take it. If a man is sure that what he is about to do will kindle grave suspicions in men's minds, and alienate from the Church many of its earnest and loyal members, he must be satisfied that the step is one absolutely necessary to be taken.

I must really be allowed to differ with your Lordship as to the use of the black gown not being a custom in England, for though I know personally but little of that country, for which I have so profound a respect, the testimony of a host of witnesses is that the black gown is in ordinary use, or had been until very lately, and it certainly is not complimentary to that noble band of men who for years have ministered in the sanctuaries of the Mother Country to call the vestment in which so many thousands of them have appeared when preaching their Master's Gospel "a Popish rag," as it was termed by one not long since. The author of the "Double Witness" was both strongly recommended by your Lordship—the Bishop of Newfoundland, and some eminent men in the old world, think of the black gown as a vestment to be not wholly without the sanction of that sacred principle of the British Constitution—Prescription—and it would seem reasonable that when and is willing to create a storm and kindle men's passions by

pressing the use of a surplice, he must be urged to it by the firm conviction that it is of importance. No one can doubt that it is more convenient for a clergyman going a long distance—not to carry a gown, and many in going to remote places where nothing was known of white, black, or any other color, and wore their surplice only, as I have heard—and I seriously doubt whether any one ever found fault with them for so doing. The people neither knew nor cared, when a minister first came among them whether he wore a white gown, or a black gown, or no gown at all. But when in old established Churches the custom is *changed*, the people think that importance is attached to it, and naturally suspicion is aroused.

Your Lordship speaks of the gown as wholly unauthorized. Now, I have frequently seen you preach in a silk gown on Good Friday in St. Paul's, having on a crape scarf, and other insignia of some peculiar kind, about your neck and arms. Whether these are authorized or not, I cannot pretend to say, if they are by any rule or direction I confess my ignorance. To pass over a stole on one shoulder, the omission of the old long-used bands, &c., when I call such things "Church Millinery" I fully admit that I use a term found in books, magazines, papers, and periodicals, of all kinds,—a term indeed so common as to be met with in the writings of all degrees of men, lay, and clerical.

Your Lordship says that the surplice is not a badge of party. There can be no question that it was so in England and in this country, and that violent contests arose concerning its use, and sure I am that in this colony it is *still* viewed as a badge of party, and men will look upon it as such, as circumstances seem to prove.

Your next observation is, "you erroneously assert that I urge the placing of Credence Tables in Churches," and you add, "I have not done so." Is it really possible that you can forget the painful scene in St. Paul's vestry a few years ago, and your own repeated charge to the late Archdeacon on that morning? Is it not *wringing* the placing of Credence Tables when a table is placed within the rails, and when that is taken away that a chair is substituted in its place, and the Archdeacon still directed to attend to the Orders after that again is removed? I certainly do not understand language if that which I then heard did

not convey the idea of urging. What were the plain facts? There never had been a Credence Table at St. Paul's, the bread and wine were brought from a closet under the pulpit (which, as is well known was outside the communion rails) previous to the reading of the prayer for the Church Militant, and then placed on the table. Do not let the questions be confused. One is the proper time of placing the bread and wine on the table, the other is a Credence Table. The questions are entirely separate: and it was the fact of a *Credence Table* being urged that was the cause of suspicion and offence. Your Lordship states that you have no Credence Table at Salem. Now I am told that there is a table, though it happens to be in the form of a chair. The shape is not of importance in so far as the fact is concerned, and be it table, chair, or shelf, it seems unanswerable that the Credence Table is there.

As regards "bodily worship," you are well aware that within the limits—"let all things be done decently and in order," no one is more anxious for reverence than myself. You know that I do not find fault with kneeling. That and such other reverent and simple modes as we Protestants have long been accustomed to are not what I condemn. I specified what I meant, and I maintain and still declare that frequent bowings, genuflections, turnings, crossings, all of which I have seen with my own eyes, are not the ancient customs of our Reformed Church. These things are new, at least, to thousands of my fellow-countrymen.

But in addition to these, I spoke of one thing, which, if not true, will afford me deep gratification, and relieve my mind of a heavy burden of pain and sorrow. I have read not long since in a certain directory for the conduct of the officiating minister, the proper mode of holding three fingers of the human hand at certain mention of the sacred *Three in One*. I was horrified at such an emblem; and, I assure you that my blood chilled, and a feeling of fear crept over me when I saw your Lordship, as I then believed, form that figure when pronouncing the benediction at St. Paul's. If I am mistaken, it was only because unintentionally your hand fell into the exact shape and figure clearly laid down in the book to which I refer. Now such are my conscientious convictions on the impropriety, to use no stronger word, of such an act, that language would

be weak to express my feelings; and, believe me, that I shall deeply regret that I was led by an illusion, if such it turns out to be, to impute the act to your Lordship, and so grave and serious a matter does it seem to me, that if wrong, I am ready and hereby do apologize to the fullest extent for even misunderstanding you.

That the Lord's Supper is now fondly termed the Eucharist, you can easily prove by reading the productions of numerous authors—I meet with it frequently.

You speak in the same way as myself of those false members of the Church of England who are "substituting bread and wine for that great and gracious Being." And does your Lordship mean seriously to tell me that this is not done, when in the Church paper, generally known and accepted as the organ of the Church of England in this Diocese—a letter appears in which these words are used, "to which is added in the case of priests, the offering at least once in three months, of the Holy Sacrifice for the same intention." Need I, when the fact is undeniable that such words exist, waste time with argument to prove that there is some one in the Diocese who is bold enough to propound the view that the Lord's Supper is a holy sacrifice. There is the fact, and it is a stubborn thing, and cannot be put out of the way; and is it uncharitable to infer that the person who wrote it is familiar with the "Priest's Prayer Book" from page 17 of which the collect is selected. At any rate, the views of the writer on the Lord's Supper are similar to the views set forth in that book, as may be seen from its latter pages. In another letter occur the following words, "his Lordship particularly alluded to the awful neglect of our blessed Lord's words, by the many who withdraw themselves from the most Holy Sacrament of His sacred Body and Blood." If language conveys any meaning at all, the bread and wine is here called "His sacred Body and Blood," and I hold that this is "substituting bread and wine for that great and gracious Being."

And is not the proposal for union with the Church of Rome and the Greek Church to be found in the same periodical? It does not alter the fact that those letters were not editorials. Some one or more than some one in the Diocese holds these views, for he has frankly written, printed and published them to the wide world. But I go further and hold that the organ of the Church of England

is morally responsible. Would an editor of a secular paper in this country be justified or held guiltless of crime if he allowed two letters to appear, proposing annexation to the United States, and calling upon the people to do their best to bring it about, preaching sedition, and disloyalty to our gracious sovereign, and never publishing one word for weeks together to shew his own disapprobation of the treasonable designs of his correspondent, but allowing the poisonous leaven to work through the country? Did he dare to do it, the whole country would rise in indignation. And as I view matters of eternal interest as of infinitely greater moment than political, I look upon the grave proposal to annex the Church of England to the Church of Rome and the Greek Church as an annexation far more serious in its nature than annexation with the United States, while I deem the substitution of the elements of bread and wine as the deepest disloyalty to our heavenly Sovereign. Faithful allegiance to Him and His Kingdom demand from the true and the brave an outspoken repudiation of such principles and sentiments. And when in a public organ I am asked to use my efforts to bring about a union with Rome, I publicly and indignantly answer, *I will not*, — and I ask whence comes the invitation? And when the Church to which I belong is allowed to put forth vital doctrines contrary to her teaching, is no man to raise his voice and say, These are not the doctrines which the Church holds and teaches, — this "New System" is a false representation of her principles.

You charge me with creating prejudices, and arousing passions, &c. Does your Lordship mean that I wrote those letters? for I know no other possible way by which the beginning of this discussion can be attributed to me. If indeed I were the author of the letters in the October number of the *Church Chronicle*, I might well and truly be charged with casting a firebrand into the Diocese. But I did not write them, and so the charge does not come home. The arrow has missed its aim. My position is that of a defender of the truth. The Church that I love more dearly than my country has been grossly assailed, and I am put by that fact in the place of the besieged. Is it not a monstrous thing that in this free country and enlightened age the Church of Christ is to be attacked, and a man to be found fault with because he stands upon the

battlements and confronts the foe? I must repeat it, it is not I who began the conflict, I but oppose the besiegers.

Let me return to "Church Furniture." I spoke particularly of the Communion Table. Now, in the same letter signed "one who was present," if your Lordship does not, I certainly do see some one "pining after Church furniture," &c. I cannot help thinking that the author of that letter most deeply regrets the absence of altar, super-altar, and steps—if he does not he has been most sadly misunderstood by an enormous number of people. But am I wrong in supposing that your Lordship wishes to have the Communion Table raised to at least a certain height? I am not now speaking of any reason which might be assigned for it, but simply of the fact. That some one exists in the Diocese who would wish for the three steps is to be clearly seen in the letter in the *Church Chronicle*. And with regard to cloths of handsome and rich embroidery, I have heard the costly and beautiful cloths on the table at the Cathedral admired very much by people of excellent taste in matters of art; and indeed have been told that the "fair white linen cloth" on a late occasion was so scant that it scarcely if at all concealed from view the exquisite workmanship. In speaking of approaching the table with awe I certainly am at liberty to use my own eyes and gather from men's conduct and gestures whether they esteem one place more sacred than another, and as I have seen men turn round to the Communion Table, it is certainly a natural conclusion that they esteem it more than ordinarily sacred.

As regards the alterations at St. Paul's, in which I was deeply interested, and about which I spent a considerable amount of time, the answer is very simple. The greatest part of the alteration was purely utilitarian,—whatever ornament was added, such as a better reading desk, had no symbolism in it, and could not possibly be construed into having any such meaning.

There are only two or three other points to be treated of before I reach your observations on my summary. First, concerning your Charge in reference to the Greek Church. As it so happened that I do know something of that Church, its tenets and its rites, I was grieved and pained to the last degree to hear that measure publicly advocated. It is true the bodies referred to by you, in

England and America have caused an investigation to be instituted; but that course is a widely different thing from hastily wishing for a union with that Church. They, doubtless, will look well into the question before they express or imply a strongly favorable opinion on the matter. My sorrow was evoked by, to me, the painful, disappointing thought that the *sympathy* was with the Greek Church in preference to those Protestant Churches who in their own way have so long and so well been doing Christ's work on earth. Of the effects produced by your Lordship's Charge you have the first-fruits in the letter of the *Church Chronicle* signed "F." This person quotes you as follows—"The words of our Bishop on the subject (of unity) in his Charge are full of the true spirit of Christian love." He at least was influenced, and so strongly influenced that he has actually gone farther than your Lordship. And do you suppose that any one would have written that letter if the Charge had not suggested and encouraged it? We may doubt if any one would have dreamed of publishing that proposal to the Protestant Church of England in this Colony unless he had first heard or read that Charge.

It is honest and fair to say to your Lordship that some of your own sermons on the Lord's Supper have been so misunderstood by intelligent persons, that they have believed you to hold that though the bread and wine remain bread and wine, that in some sense *they become* what they were not before. But from what I gather from your Lordship's letter on this subject, I presume that they were mistaken. Such, however, from some cause, either brevity or mode of expression, has been the impression, and, as it seems a wrong one, do you not think it would relieve the minds of many were you to publish your views on this all-important subject? Again, it is honest and fair to tell your Lordship that you are misunderstood on the subject of prayers for the dead. Persons of acknowledged intelligence and clearness of discernment have collected from your sermons that you thought the Church of England countenanced this doctrine. Nor is it long since that your sermon on last Easter Sunday or Easter Eve, or some festival, was quoted by two students in the Lecture Room at King's College, in order to confute the Professor of Theology, who at the time was attempting to show that this

was a dogma not held nor taught by the Church of England. You will, therefore, perceive how thoroughly your Lordship has been misunderstood, if you have "never heard of advocacy of prayers for the dead."

We now reach the "summary" which you have treated at great length, but which requires very few words from me, as you have assumed that which is not fact; and in a grave matter like this I cannot but request that your Lordship will be particular and careful in animadverting upon what I do say, and not upon what I do not say. If you look at my letter you will perceive that my "summary" is "Church Furniture, Clerical Millinery, and Posture Making." These I have substantiated in the foregoing pages. On this summary I proceeded to make some general observations, stating what I believe to be the necessary result of small beginnings, namely: I characterize the views and opinions of the party who hold and practise such sentiments and customs as a "morbid sentimentalism" deducing from my own observations, and that of eminent men, with whom I do not profess to compare myself, the broad conclusion that the system, of which I consider these things named a part, is "*seeking to introduce by degrees the whole sacerdotal doctrines and practice,*" &c., and I add as another guard at the close—"this and more than this, the *DEVELOPMENT of the system* introduced into our once peaceful midst." My belief is, as it has been, that whether men know it or not, the things of which I have spoken are part of a system that in drawing to its legitimate conclusion will land them on the ground of extreme ritualism, and, finally, departure from the Church of their fathers. Whatever opinions I may have as to the length which some have reached, I have carefully avoided using the word "clergy," but if any men do hold these views, I doubt not that time will show, and I sincerely trust that they will have the manliness to avow their views if they ever should be charged by your Lordship, or any one else, with holding them.

That our Church is in peril I have no doubt: all over the world it is being rent asunder, chiefly by the introduction of emblematical novelties. The movements which have now reached so sad a crisis in England, began, strangely enough, just as this is beginning here. First, a little regard to vestments and furniture, then a "fuller ceremo-

nial," then extreme High Churchism, then Ritualism. It is a sure, onward, steady growth. One great law governs. Plant the seed and it takes root and germinates.

My charge against my brethren in the ministry of having reached the development which I speak of, you will observe is without foundation. To use your own language or simile, I see the wave and feel its swell, and have done my duty in pointing it out, and offering my most solemn warning.

Others think and feel as I do. You will listen to a brother Bishop—Hear what he says,—“This is the evil which is now over-spreading our Church at home, and from which I trust by God’s grace, we may be delivered. The very first approach to it should be studiously avoided. It often makes its appearance in small things—in some trifling departure from established usage, which a sensible man might be supposed to regard as unimportant, until he who has commenced with bowings, crossings, genuflexions, and turning his back upon his congregation in certain parts of the service, without perhaps, intending to inculcate any doctrine thereby, finds himself in the end introducing incense, candles, elevations and prostrations, and clothed in the sacrificial vestments of a priest of Rome, and prepared to hold and teach the idolatrous doctrine symbolised by such vestments.”

These words of a Colonial Bishop I never saw until a day or two since, and I reproduce them as containing exactly my views drawn out from my summary.

Finally, trusting that good may arise from the attack made upon the Church of England by the articles in the *Church Chronicle*, and that the evil so startling brought into our peaceful midst by the false doctrines therein propounded, and that with God’s help and His glory alone in view we may yet sift the chaff from the wheat, and that I may stand beside your Lordship to lend my aid in grappling with evil, and seeking to advance the kingdom of our Lord.

I am, my Lord, very truly,

GEORGE W. HILL.

P. S.—In consequence of much misunderstanding, I think it probable that I shall be compelled to publish the correspondence that has taken place between us.

On Saturday, Nov. 17th, I received the following note from the Bishop:

HALIFAX, Nov. 16th, 1860.

DEAR SIR,—I have received your letter of the 12th inst. As it contains no apology or expression of regret for the tone and temper of your first letter, as you rather appear to glory in your disregard of ordinary courtesy and in ignoring the relationship of a clergyman to his Bishop, and more especially as you have passed over without notice the most important part of my letter of 5th inst, and have evaded answering the questions contained in it, I feel that I should not be justified in continuing a correspondence which cannot be productive of any good result, if it is to be conducted after this manner on your side.

Since you have proposed publishing the correspondence I of course claim the same liberty, and I desire that it may be widely circulated throughout the Diocese.

I am, Rev. Sir, Yours faithfully,

Rev. G. W. Hill.

H. NOVA SCOTIA.

To this note I of course made no reply; but as his Lordship says "that I have passed over without notice the most important part of his letter of 5th inst.; and have evaded answering the questions contained in it," I feel it imperative upon me to state that I have not evaded them, simply because I did not make the charges of which I am, in that part of his letter, accused; and therefore could not be asked to substantiate them. I beg to call your special attention to the fact, that I said the *system of which I believed certain doctrines and practices were a part, sought to introduce other doctrines*, and that those doctrines were the *development of that system*. I did not make the charge that this system was yet so developed, and I do not make it now; but what I did say was—that if such doctrines and practices as those published and approved had taken root, this whole "*sacerdotal system*" would be the full-blown flower—and I believe it still. In order to show that I am not singular, permit me to say that I met, in the course of my reading, with the very observations made in my letter, in a published address of one of the most eminent Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States—

Dr. McIlvaine, Bishop of Ohio—and which so singularly harmonized with my own views on this subject that I adopted, in this paragraph, his language for my own. These are his words—

“under such morbid sentimentalism, calling itself the real spirituality, to introduce, by degrees, the whole sacerdotal doctrine and practice of a sacrificing Priesthood, and of sacraments efficacious (*ex opere operato*) to salvation, because received at such hands; the visible church, the only depository of saving grace; true Ministers, *real Priests*, having a real sacrifice to offer, and at a real altar—remission of sins obtained only through their ministry, in which they stand as mediators between us and God, so that by them only we come to Christ, and through him to God.”

If you will compare my letter with these words, you will observe that I was even more guarded than the Bishop, who, like myself, was attacking “a system,” and so I added “all this, and more than this—the *development*,” etc.

I now leave the correspondence to speak for itself. No one will rejoice more than myself if it be proved that my fears are unfounded. My sole object has been, and now is, to contend with *principles* and not *persons*, and most deeply do I regret that personal offence should have been taken, since I meant, as I now mean, to show no disrespect to any. No one more earnestly and sincerely prays that “all who profess and call themselves Christians should hold the faith in the unity of the Spirit, the bond of peace, and righteousness of life.” But he is no man who will have peace at the expense of conscience; and surely hoping that the painful duty performed in striving to repel error in its beginning will in the end promote the glory of God; and that we may even be able to do this in seeking to advance the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour.

I am your faithful servant,

GEORGE W. HILL,
Rector of St. Paul's.

arly
at I
wn.

call-
ees,
ing
ope-
the
true
and
ough
reen
and

you
hop,
so I
etc.
No
my
ow is,
most
been
disre-
prays
tians
bond
man
and
aving
in the
and all
Lord
ant,
L.
Paul's.

